

Application Serial No.: 10/004,173
Art Unit: 2622

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding final Office Action mailed December 29, 2005. Claims 1-18 remain pending in the present application. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and pending claims are respectfully requested.

Response To Rejections of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Takimoto* (U.S. Patent No. 6,202,092) in view of *Higley* (U.S. Patent No. 5,913,025). It is well-established at law that, for a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious based upon a combination of references, the cited combination of references must disclose, teach, or suggest, either implicitly or explicitly, all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue. See, e.g., *In Re Dow Chemical*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1988), and *In re Keller*, 208 U.S.P.Q.2d 871, 881 (C.C.P.A. 1981).

a. Claims 1-5

As provided in independent claim 1, Applicants claim:

A print server, for processing a print job sent by a workstation, the print server comprising:

a printer set-up module to provide a print driver for installation on the workstation; and

an authentication module to supply an authentication code to the workstation, and to review the print job sent by the workstation to determine validity of a copy of the authentication code attached to the print job.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that the proposed combination of *Takimoto* in view of *Higley* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "a printer set-up module to provide a print driver for installation on the workstation; and an authentication module to supply an authentication code to the workstation, and to review the print job sent by the workstation to determine validity of a copy of the authentication code attached to the print job," as recited and emphasized above in claim 1.

In explaining the rejection, the Office Action states that the server computer 2 in *Takimoto* "would also functions as a printer set up module as figure 1 clearly shows a printer driver [22] as a component of the server computer." Office Action, page 2. Applicants disagree.

Application Serial No.: 10/004,173
Art Unit: 2622

Applicants submit that *Takimoto* does not suggest that the printer driver 22 functions as a printer set up module. Rather, Applicants respectfully submit that the printer driver of the server computer analyzes a print request at the server computer 2. It does not seem that a printer set up module is referenced anywhere in the *Takimoto* disclosure. Therefore, Applicants are unable to see how one of ordinary skill in the art could examine the teachings of the cited references and produce the claimed subject matter, without using hindsight reasoning.

In particular, *Takimoto* appears to disclose at most a print system in which "a document prepared by the user application 11 on the client computer is transferred to the server computer 2 via the network drivers 12 and 21. The printer driver 22 on the server computer 2 analyzes, in the print request analyzing section 22a, a user ID (identifying information) and information such as the number of pages to print, the kind of paper, and special printing functions requested by the user." Col. 3, lines 52-58.

As such, *Takimoto* fails to teach or suggest a print driver for installation on a workstation and an authentication code being supplied to a workstation, where the authentication code is also sent with a print job and is analyzed for validity. For example, FIG. 2 shows that a print request is not supplied with an authentication code. Even the step of acquiring a USER ID occurs before a print job is requested in step S2. Therefore, *Takimoto* fails to teach or suggest at least "a printer set-up module to provide a print driver for installation on the workstation; and an authentication module to supply an authentication code to the workstation, and to review the print job sent by the workstation to determine validity of a copy of the authentication code attached to the print job," as recited in claim 1.

Further, *Higley* fails to cure the deficiencies of the *Takimoto* reference in suggesting or teaching all of the claimed features in claim 1. With regard to *Higley*, it appears to teach at most an approach for a user to log in as a source object with a server, where as a source object, the user already has been assigned the right to access a target object and to also modify the target object's authentication data. In particular, *Higley* states: "Having logged in as the source object 32, the source 23 has obtained the rights 33 of the source object 32, including authorization to access the target object 36 and to modify the authentication data 38 of the target object 36. The next step 42 involves the source 23 generating new authentication data." Col. 5, 60-67. Therefore, Applicants respectfully fail to understand how *Higley* teaches or suggests the supplying of an authentication by a print server to a workstation, for example.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Application Serial No.: 10/004,173
Art Unit: 2622

Accordingly, the proposed combination of *Takimoto* in view of *Higley* does not disclose all of the claimed features of claim 1. Therefore, a *prima facie* case establishing an obviousness rejection by the proposed combination has not been made, and the rejection of claim 1 and claims 2-5 (which depend from claim 1) should be withdrawn.

With regard to the alternative processes suggested in the Office Action and the characterizations of the worthiness of the claimed features and whether or not they made sense, Applicants fail to appreciate the pertinence of these statements and reference the specification for any questions the Examiner may have towards the claimed subject matter.

b. Claims 6-9

As provided in independent claim 6, Applicants claim:

A method of printing, comprising:
attaching a workstation to a LAN;
downloading and installing a print driver on the workstation;
downloading an authentication code to the workstation;
sending a print job, containing the authentication code, from the workstation to a print server;
verifying validity of the authentication code; and
sending the print job from the print server to a printer.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 6 is allowable for at least the reason that the proposed combination of *Takimoto* in view of *Higley* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "downloading and installing a print driver on the workstation; downloading an authentication code to the workstation; sending a print job, containing the authentication code, from the workstation to a print server; [and] verifying validity of the authentication code," as recited and emphasized above in claim 6.

For at least the reasons provided with regard to claim 1, *Takimoto* fails to teach or suggest a print driver for installation on a workstation and an authentication code being supplied to a workstation, where the authentication code is also sent with a print job and is analyzed for validity. For example, FIG. 2 shows that a print request is not supplied with an authentication code. Even the step of acquiring a USER ID occurs before a print job is requested in step S2. Therefore, *Takimoto* fails to teach or suggest at least "downloading and installing a print driver on the workstation; downloading an authentication code to the workstation; sending a print job, containing the authentication code, from the workstation to a print server; [and] verifying validity of the authentication code," as recited in claim 6.

Application Serial No.: 10/004,173
Art Unit: 2622

Further, *Higley* fails to cure the deficiencies of the *Takimoto* reference in suggesting or teaching all of the claimed features in claim 6. With regard to *Higley*, it appears to teach at most an approach for a user to log in as a source object with a server, where as a source object, the user already has been assigned the right to access a target object and to also modify the target object's authentication data. In particular, *Higley* states: "Having logged in as the source object 32, the source 23 has obtained the rights 33 of the source object 32, including authorization to access the target object 36 and to modify the authentication data 38 of the target object 36. The next step 42 involves the source 23 generating new authentication data." Col. 5, 60-67. Therefore, Applicants respectfully fail to understand how *Higley* teaches or suggests the supplying of an authentication by a print server to a workstation, for example.

Accordingly, the proposed combination of *Takimoto* in view of *Higley* does not disclose all of the claimed features of claim 6. Therefore, a *prima facie* case establishing an obviousness rejection by the proposed combination has not been made, and the rejection of claim 6 and claims 7-9 (which depend from claim 6) should be withdrawn.

c. Claims 10-12

As provided in independent claim 10, Applicants claim:

A method of authenticating a print job, comprising:
downloading and installing a print driver on a workstation;
downloading an authentication code to the workstation;
sending a print job, containing the authentication code, from the
workstation to a print server;
verifying validity of the authentication code; and
sending the print job to a printer.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10 is allowable for at least the reason that the proposed combination of *Takimoto* in view of *Higley* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "downloading and installing a print driver on a workstation; downloading an authentication code to the workstation; sending a print job, containing the authentication code, from the workstation to a print server; [and] verifying validity of the authentication code," as recited and emphasized above in claim 10.

For at least the reasons provided with regard to claim 1, *Takimoto* fails to teach or suggest a print driver for installation on a workstation and an authentication code being supplied to a workstation, where the authentication code is also sent with a print job and is

Application Serial No.: 10/004,173
Art Unit: 2622

analyzed for validity. For example, FIG. 2 shows that a print request is not supplied with an authentication code. Even the step of acquiring a USER ID occurs before a print job is requested in step S2. Therefore, *Takimoto* fails to teach or suggest at least "downloading and installing a print driver on a workstation; downloading an authentication code to the workstation; sending a print job, containing the authentication code, from the workstation to a print server; [and] verifying validity of the authentication code," as recited and emphasized above in claim 10.

Further, *Higley* fails to cure the deficiencies of the *Takimoto* reference in suggesting or teaching all of the claimed features in claim 10. With regard to *Higley*, it appears to teach at most an approach for a user to log in as a source object with a server, where as a source object, the user already has been assigned the right to access a target object and to also modify the target object's authentication data. In particular, *Higley* states: "Having logged in as the source object 32, the source 23 has obtained the rights 33 of the source object 32, including authorization to access the target object 36 and to modify the authentication data 38 of the target object 36. The next step 42 involves the source 23 generating new authentication data." Col. 5: 60-67. Therefore, Applicants respectfully fail to understand how *Higley* teaches or suggests the supplying of an authentication by a print server to a workstation, for example.

Accordingly, the proposed combination of *Takimoto* in view of *Higley* does not disclose all of the claimed features of claim 10. Therefore, a *prima facie* case establishing an obviousness rejection by the proposed combination has not been made, and the rejection of claim 10 and claims 11-12 (which depend from claim 10) should be withdrawn.

d. Claims 13-17

As provided in independent claim 13, Applicants claim:

A processor-readable medium having processor-executable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to:

download and install a print driver on a workstation;
download and install an authentication code on the workstation;
send a print job, containing the authentication code, from the workstation to a print server;
verify validity of the authentication code using an authentication module on the print server; and
send the print job from the print server to a printer.

(Emphasis added).

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Application Serial No.: 10/004,173
Art Unit: 2622

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 13 is allowable for at least the reason that the proposed combination of *Takimoto* in view of *Higley* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "download and install a print driver on a workstation; download and install an authentication code on the workstation; send a print job, containing the authentication code, from the workstation to a print server; verify validity of the authentication code using an authentication module on the print server," as recited and emphasized above in claim 13.

For at least the reasons provided with regard to claim 1, *Takimoto* fails to teach or suggest a print driver for installation on a workstation and an authentication code being supplied to a workstation, where the authentication code is also sent with a print job and is analyzed for validity. For example, FIG. 2 shows that a print request is not supplied with an authentication code. Even the step of acquiring a USER ID occurs before a print job is requested in step S2. Therefore, *Takimoto* fails to teach or suggest at least "download and install a print driver on a workstation; download and install an authentication code on the workstation; send a print job, containing the authentication code, from the workstation to a print server; verify validity of the authentication code using an authentication module on the print server," as recited and emphasized above in claim 13.

Further, *Higley* fails to cure the deficiencies of the *Takimoto* reference in suggesting or teaching all of the claimed features in claim 13. With regard to *Higley*, it appears to teach at most an approach for a user to log in as a source object with a server, where as a source object, the user already has been assigned the right to access a target object and to also modify the target object's authentication data. In particular, *Higley* states: "Having logged in as the source object 32, the source 23 has obtained the rights 33 of the source object 32, including authorization to access the target object 36 and to modify the authentication data 38 of the target object 36. The next step 42 involves the source 23 generating new authentication data." Col. 5, 60-67. Therefore, Applicants respectfully fail to understand how *Higley* teaches or suggests the supplying of an authentication by a print server to a workstation, for example.

Accordingly, the proposed combination of *Takimoto* in view of *Higley* does not disclose all of the claimed features of claim 13. Therefore, a *prima facie* case establishing an obviousness rejection by the proposed combination has not been made, and the rejection of claim 13 and claims 14-17 (which depend from claim 13) should be withdrawn.

Application Serial No.: 10/004,173
Art Unit: 2622

e. Claim 18

As provided in independent claim 18, Applicants claim:

A print server, comprising:

a printer set-up module to provide a print driver for installation on a workstation; and

an authentication module to supply an authentication code to the workstation, and to review a print job processed by the print driver and sent from the workstation to determine validity of the authentication code attached to the print job.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 18 is allowable for at least the reason that the proposed combination of *Takimoto* in view of *Higley* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "a printer set-up module to provide a print driver for installation on a workstation; and an authentication module to supply an authentication code to the workstation, and to review a print job processed by the print driver and sent from the workstation to determine validity of the authentication code attached to the print job," as recited and emphasized above in claim 18.

For at least the reasons provided with regard to claim 1, *Takimoto* fails to teach or suggest a print driver for installation on a workstation and an authentication code being supplied to a workstation, where the authentication code is also sent with a print job and is analyzed for validity. For example, FIG. 2 shows that a print request is not supplied with an authentication code. Even the step of acquiring a USER ID occurs before a print job is requested in step S2. Therefore, *Takimoto* fails to teach or suggest at least "a printer set-up module to provide a print driver for installation on a workstation; and an authentication module to supply an authentication code to the workstation, and to review a print job processed by the print driver and sent from the workstation to determine validity of the authentication code attached to the print job," as recited and emphasized above in claim 18.

Further, *Higley* fails to cure the deficiencies of the *Takimoto* reference in suggesting or teaching all of the claimed features in claim 18. With regard to *Higley*, it appears to teach at most an approach for a user to log in as a source object with a server, where as a source object, the user already has been assigned the right to access a target object and to also modify the target object's authentication data. In particular, *Higley* states: "Having logged in as the source object 32, the source 23 has obtained the rights 33 of the source object 32, including authorization to access the target object 36 and to modify the authentication data 38 of the target object 36. The next step 42 involves the source 23 generating new authentication data."

Application Serial No.: 10/004,173
Art Unit: 2622

Col. 5, 60-67. Therefore, Applicants respectfully fail to understand how *Higley* teaches or suggests the supplying of an authentication by a print server to a workstation, for example.

Accordingly, the proposed combination of *Takimoto* in view of *Higley* does not disclose all of the claimed features of claim 18. Therefore, a *prima facie* case establishing an obviousness rejection by the proposed combination has not been made, and the rejection of claim 18 should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,


Charles W. Griggers, Reg. No. 47,283